ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ಗಂಗಾಧರ್.—ಇನ್‌ಡಿಸ್ಕ್ರಿಮಿನೇಟ್‌ಆಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ರೀತಿಯ ಜಮೀನನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಡಿಸ್‌ಪೋಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಆಗಿದೆ ಈಗ ಗ ಂಡು ತೋಪು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈ ತೋಪಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಿ, ಅಶ್ವತ್ಥಕಟ್ಟೆ ಮಂಟಪ ಎಲ್ಲ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನಾದರೂ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರ ಕೋರಿಕೆಯಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉಳಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ವಿ. ಕೌಜಲಗಿ.—ಗುಂಡು ತೋಪಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಸಬರು ಕಳೆದ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಅನಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ತಗ್ಗು ತೋಡಿ ತೆಂಗಿನ ಸಸಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರ ತಕರಾರು ಇದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ಗಂಗಾಧರ್.—ಗುಂಡುತೋಪಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಂಗಿನ ಸಸಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಮಂಟಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಂಗಿನ ಸಸಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಶ್ವತ್ಥಕಟ್ಟೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಂಗಿನ ಸಸಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಣ್ಣ ಗುಡಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ತೋಪನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರ ಕೋರಿಕೆಯಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉಳಿಸಿ ಕೊಡ ರಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ವಿ. ಕೌಜಲಗಿ.—ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಿ, ಅಶ್ವತ್ಥಕಟ್ಟೆ ಇಂಥವುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿದ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರಿಂದ ಮನವಿಗಳು ಬಂದುದರಿಂದ ಪುನಃ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡ ಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ಗಂಗಾಧರ್.—ವರ್ಷೇ ವರ್ಷೇ ಆ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಷೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗುಂಡು ತೋಪು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಬಾರಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಕೋರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ನೆರವೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—The matter is under consideration. Both parties will have to take this into consideration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Question time is over.

Personal Explanation by Sri H. Siddaveerappa *re* : the Incident in the House on 24th September 1970.

† Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihara).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have sought your permission to make a statement with regard to what transpired yesterday and how it happened. I am grateful to you for having given me a chance to explain certain facts and bring them to the notice of this House. As you are aware—I think you were also present in the House—soon after the Question Hour, two hon. Members of this House, namely, Sri Vatal Nagaraj and Sri C. M. S. Sastry, raised certain points with regard to the all-important burning problem of yesterday, namely, the student agitation. At that time, the Hon. Speaker said in an imperious tone as it were, that he is not going to allow anything to be recorded. This question has come up quite a number of times before this House, so far. I only wanted to request the Speaker on a point of order to state under what provision of the rules of business he could say 'Don't record'. That was all my object. I have read the rules very carefully. I have some little experience of parliamentary business as I have been associated with it for over

25 years. When I asked : "Under what provision you could say that it should not be recorded", the Speakar had no reply. He only said that "I am going to say it shall not be recorded." The manner in which the Speaker said it, the tone in which he said, the tenor of his voice and the mode of approach were nothing but insulting this side of the House. Even the other day when my friend Sri Badrinarayan about whom the whole House knows what a quiet type of gentleman he is, rose, the Speaker handled him in a very rough manner. Then alone I said, the way in which the Speaker is handling this side of the House is only insulting, When I said that and when he refused, I had no alternative before me. When the Speaker himself refuses to act according to the rules, when the Speaker himself violates the rules, and when he does anything against the rules, I have no other alternative but to refuse to accept the Speaker and his ruling and I said. I cannot allow it, you must come down. Of course he has taken it as gherao. My object was only to tell him he is not fit to occupy that place and he must come down, because he was not in any way co-operating with this side of the House. After all, the general rule is 'give respect and take respect in life'. However there is a feeling on this side of the House that the Speaker is the mouthpiece of the executive government and he has been doing everything to satisfy a section of the House and he is trying to insult this side of the House. The rules are very clear.

Here I want to bring certain things to the notice of the Secretary of the House who is sitting here before us. We have got regard for him because he has got very long experience, but I think he has subordinated his power when he has yielded to the ruling of the Chair when the Chair said. "Don't record it". I shall read the relevant rules with regard to this point namely, rules 314 and 315 which are very clear.

SRI B. P. GANGADHAR.—Do you mean to say that the Secretary should flout the Chair ?

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am going to say whatever I have got to say and it is for you to take it whichever way you like. Rule 314 says :

> " The Secretary shall cause to be prepared a full report of the proceedings of the Assembly on each of its sitting and shall as soon as practicable publish it in such form and manner as the Speaker may from time to time direct."

Here, there are two parts. We have enjoined upon the Secretary of this House the responsibility of preparing a full report, not a partial report, not a mutilated report, not a report which has been torn here and there. According to this, it is his responsibility which we have laid down under the rule. Under this rule the Speaker's power is limited; he can only say, 'publish it in this form or in that form or in this manner or in that manner.' Beyond that he cannot do anything arbitrarily; he cannot do anything capriciously ; he cannot do anything in violation of the rule. My respectful submission is that the

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

rule is very clear, categorical and unequivocal and nothing is left to the discretion of the Speaker and he has to prepare a full report of the proceedings of the House. Then comes Rule 315. That is the rule which gives certain powers to the Speakar. It says :—

> "If the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words has or have been used in debate which is or are defamatory or indecent, or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such word or words be expunged from the proceedings of the Assembly".

Of course, that power is given to the Speaker. Please note what is stated here. "a word or words".

SRI K. H. SRINIVASA.—Sir, I rise to a Point of Order. The hon. members of this House are entitled to know what exactly is the business that the House is seized with. We were not given to understand about this item in the Agenda that is circulated to us. I would like to know what exactly is the business that has been allowed just now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have permitted hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa because he has given a notice.

SRI K. H. SRINIVASA.—The House was not informed that the hon. Member was allowed to make such and such a statement with reference to such and such notice.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I do not know whether the hon. Secretary of the Ruling Party was present when I was permitted. I did seek the permission of the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಗಂಗಣ್ಣ (ಕಳ್ಳಂಬೆಳ್ಳ).—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್, ಸರ್. ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ಧವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೇನೆಲ್ಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು, ನಂತೋಷ. ಅದು ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರ. ಸ್ಪೀಕರ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅಹರ್ರಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಕೆಳಗಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಆ ಫೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಅವರ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂತು. ಅದು ಕಾನೂನುಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಅವರು ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಓರರ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಲಿಖಿತವಾಗಿ ಏನೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ನೋಟೀಸು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎನ್. ರಾವ ಣ್ಣ.—ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ, ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಅದನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರವರು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕು.

SRI K. H. SRINIVASA. We thought you have permitted the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa for a personal explanation of what has happened. We find from his speech that he is trying to justify various allegations that are being made against the Speaker. Have you permitted that ?

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I think it was not necessary to read what is all stated in my notice. I have been permitted by the Chair. I don't mind any interruption.

Coming to the point, I was referring to Rule 315 of the Rules of Procedure. This is all the power that has been given to the Speaker under the Rule and the Speaker has no other power except exercising what has been given under Rule 315. Supposing I put it this way. We want to stage a walk-out and if what has been said is not to be recorded.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಐ. ಸೋಮಶೇಖರಪ್ಪ. ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ನಡತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಪೆಸಿಫಿಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೆ, ಹೇಗೆ? ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ನಡತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I request all the hon. Members not to speak anything about what happened yesterday. Some heat was produced and something happened which was unfortunate.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಗುರಡ್ಡಿ —ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಜ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ನಡತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವರ್ತನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಉಚಿತವಲ್ಲ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಏನೋ ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೂ ಬೇಡ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ಗಂಗಾಧರ್.—ಅಷ್ಟು ಉಚಿತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ವಿ. ಅಗ್ನಿಹೋತ್ರಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವುದು. ನೋಟೀಸಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಓದಿ ಹೇಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯುವುದು.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—The Chair has got full powers.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎನ್. ನಂಜೇಗೌಡ. ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೋಟಿಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರ್ಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನೋಟೀಸ್ ರಿಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಲು ತಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಉಂಟು. ರೂಲ್ 312ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಅಡ್ಜರ್ನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಅಲ್ಲ. 146 ಮತ್ತು 53—ಈ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಲ್ಲ. One member has to beg leave of the House to read his motion and then leave should be granted. Here the case is different.

2-30 P.M.

Under 312 a notice is given. The Hon. Chair has permitted to proceed with the subjects. The notice is intended to bring the matter to the notice of the House. That matter is not a point of order. He is only bringing a matter to the notice of the House. When that is the position, how can these hon. Members raise point of orders on this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.— I appeal to all the hon. Members not to speak on it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.— You were pleased to state that what had transpired yesterday need not be referred to now. What I have spoken is with regard to Rules 314 and 315 which were clearly mentioned in my notice and I am bringing the relevant facts to your kind notice with regard to this thing. Rule 315 reads thus:

" If the Speakar is of opinion that a word or words has or have been used in debate which is or are defamatory or

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

indecent, or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such word or words be expunged from the proceedings of the Assembly."

This is all the power that is given to the Hon. Speakar under this rule. What I want to bring to your kind notice was whenever a Speaker or the Presiding Officer does not act within the ambit of the rules, we have to arrive at a conclusion that the Speaker is acting in an illegal manner. We wanted to stage a walk out. If there is nothing on record, what is the use of our being here. That is why the entire proceedings have to be recorded. Therefore, I am requesting the Secretary through you not to yield to the dictation of the Chair and it is his responsibility to see that the entire proceedings are recorded. If anything is done contrary to the rules, we on this side are not bound by it. We consider it as though it is not in accordance with the rules.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH (Nanjangud).— I do not want to enter into details of the statement made by the Hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa. I would like to be guided by the explanations given and also by the rulings given by the Chair. Rule 314 states that the full record of the proceedings shall be maintained. Rule 314 will have to be read with Rule 315. The word unparliamentary comes there. In case the Chair comes to a conclusion that what is happening is unparliamentary, then the rule 315 is attracted. Sri Siddaveerappa says that if a portion of the proceedings is to be expunged, foot note shall have to be inserted stating the reasons for expunction. If the Speakar comes to a conclusion that the language used is unparliamentary, and if a portion is to be deleted, the Rule 325 also is attracted. Rule 325 reads as follows:

"All matters not specifically provided for in these rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be regulated in such manner as the Speaker may from time to time direct ".

He can use his residuary powers for all the matters not specifically provided in the rules.

Sri H SIDDAVEERAPPA.— Rule 325 is attracted for exercising the residuary powers by the Speaker when there are no specific provisions under the existing rules. When there is specific rule that has to be followed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.— We are bound to follow the rules-ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಫಾಲೋ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವದು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಸಭೆಯು ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Periyapatna).— I would like to make comments on the observations made by Sri Srikantiah. The Speaker has powers to expunge a portion of the speech or the entire speech only

after the speech is recorded. Nowhere it is in vogue or in practice that the Speaker has got powers to order not to take down the speeches. Even in May's Parliamentary Procedure it is not stated like that. If it is done as our Speaker has done, it is illegal. You will have to make amends not only for yesterday but also for all these years. You have prevanted the speeches being recorded. The speeches must be recorded verbatim. That is the law.

†Sri M. NAGAPPA (Raichur).—Sir, the hon. Member Sri Srikantiah has stated that the Hon. Speaker in exercise of residuary powers can direct the persons who are recording the proceedings of this House "not to record". But we have to distinguish two things here, *viz.*, (1) the procedu al right; and (2) the substantive right. So far as the procedural right is concerned, it has to be exercised according to the procedure laid down in the rules. But a substantive right means the orders of the Speaker to the offici l reporters "not to record". It is not a procedural right. So far as the specific provisions like rule 314, 315 etc., are concerned, the Speaker cannot exercise the power vested in him under rule 325 and say that under the exercise of the power vested in him he directs the reporters "not to record" the proceedings. Even in the case of rule 315 where the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words uttered in a debate are unparliamentary etc., that word or words will have to be first recorded and they should be printed in Italics, so that any person reading the proceedings will be in a position to know what were the words uttered and expunged. Therefore my submission is that the Hon. Speaker has no right to direct the reporters "not to record" even with reference to rule 315. Therefore it is better that a clear ruling of this House should be there to the effect that henceforth the Speaker should not exercise his right to say "not to record" and it is the duty of the Secretary of Legislature to maintain full proceedings of this House. Even laughing has to be recorded in the proceedings. Therefore in my humble submission. I request you to give a considared ruling to the effoct that the Speaker has no right under residuary powers to direct the official reportes "not to record the proceedings".

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—I rise to a point of order. The whole discussion started with the letter that was written to you by the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa. He wanted to give personal explanation only with regard to what he did yesterday.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I spoke only what is mentioned in that letter.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—But what is going on now in this House s an academic discussion as to whether the Speaker has the right to ask the reporters to record or not to record the proceedings. There is no motion to this effect by any hon. Member. In fact some hon. Members wanted a ruling of the Chair on the point as to whether what the Speaker did yesterday was right or not. If you say that Speaker had no

(SRI A. R. PANCHAGAVI)

right it would be casting aspersions on the Hon. Speaker and if you say that he has the right then again we would be discussing the conduct of the Hon. Speaker, which is not permitted under the rules. Under these circumstances, I feel that this discussion should not be allowed to continue any more.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Sir, let us devote one full day for raising points of orders.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, the point raised by hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa is a very important one. Though the hon, Member has casually made reference to the action of the Hon. Speaker yesterday, the important point to consider here is, that whether the Speaker has the right to order for expunction of proceedings or words uttered on the floor of this House. I feel that the Hon. Speaker has the power to only order for expunction of particular word or words and not the entire proceedings. Therefore you should give a considered ruling on this subject.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—Sir, you have not at all disposed of my point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri Siddaveerppa has made a personal explanation, on which, there cannot be any discussion or debate, under the rules of procedure. Since this matter has come up often before this House, I permitted one or two hon. Members to express their views. Now, the matter should end there. However, I will go through the records and rules, and give a considered ruling.

Sri K. H. SRINIVASA.—Sir, this is a very important matter. I think that whatever submissions have been made by hon. Members hitherto are sufficient to enlighten the Chair to give a considered ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I shall call upon the Hon. Minister to express his views on this subject.

Sri K. H. SRINIVASA.—We are also concerned with the Rules of Procedure of this House and as such we are also entitled to an equal opportunity to explain our points of view.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the House agrees, I have no objection to allow all the members to have their say.

Sri P. VENKATAGIRIYAPPA.—Sir, every member is raising a point of order. This is not the way in which the House is to be conducted. If a member raises a point of order, the Chair should dispose it of and then only allow another member to raise another point of order. Probably the Chair is not interested in conducting the proceeeings of this House.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Rule 316 says that the portion of the proceedings of the Assembly so expunged shall be marked by asterisks and an explanatory note shall be inserted. So, let not the Chair take a hasty decision in the matter. Let him refer to the practice in Lok Sabha in this behalf and give his considered opinion.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ (ಸೊರಬ). —ಸ್ಯಾಮಿ, ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹಲವಾರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಸ್ಪೀಕರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತ ನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ರೂಲ್ 315—316 ಮತ್ತು ರಸಿದ್ಯುಯರಿ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. 316ರನ್ನು ಇನ್‌ಪೋಕ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ, 315ರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾ ರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ :

> "The portion of the proceedings of the Assembly so expunged shall be remarked by asterisks and an explanatory foot-note shall be inserted in the proceedings as follows: "
>
> 'Expunged as ordered by the Chair'."

ಡಿಫಮೇಟರಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು, ಅದು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಅನ್‌ಡಿಗ್ನಿಫೈಡ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು, ಅದು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ; ಅನ್ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು, ಅದು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನ್‌ಡಿಗ್ನಿಫೈಡ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸ್ಪೀಕರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವರದಿಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಷನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ನಾಳೆ ನನಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೆಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಆಗ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇವರು ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆಗ ನನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ದಾಖಲೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವರದಿಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಡಿ. I therefore request the Chair to give a considered opinion on this point.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರುದುರ್ಗ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ಧವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ.

3-00 P. M.

Sri AZEEZ SAIT (Narasimharaja).—I now rise to a point of order Sir, under Rule 312 or 311. ಇವತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ಧವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸ್ಪೀಕರಿಗೆ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಹಿಸ್ಟಾರಿಕಲ್ ಇವೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏನಂತಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ಧವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಹತ್ವತೆ ಇದೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಗೌರವ ಇದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾದ ಗೌರವ ಸಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪವಿತ್ರತೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತವೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಏನೇನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ,—ಅದು ರೂಲ್ಸಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. 315 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಿತ್ತು ಹಾಕಬಹುದು, ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಉಳಿದುದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೊಠಾವಳೆಯವರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳು ನಡೆದಿವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಆಗಿಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಆಗಿಂದಾಗೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ)

ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಆಗಿಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಧಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ನಾವು ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ? ಆ ಗೌರವ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅವರು ಕೂಡ ರೂಲ್ಸಿಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ತಪ್ಪದೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ರೂಲ್ಸಿಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮುಖ್ಯವೋ, ಆಡೇ ರೀತಿ ಅವರು ಕೂಡ ಇವನ್ನು ಪಾಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿದೆ ಇದೆಯೋ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 325 ಪ್ರಕಾರ ರೆಸಿಡ್ಯುಯರಿ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಹೊರತು ಉಳಿದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ರೂಲ್ಸಿಗನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಇವರು, ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನೆ ರೂಲ್ಸಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದು ಈ ನಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಗಳು ಮುಂದೆ ನಡೆಯದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಖಚಿತವಾದ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† **Sri K. H. SRINIVASA** (Sagar).—Sir, I am contributing to the discussion. I am not raising any point of order. I would invite the attention of the Hon'ble Members to Rules 315 and 325. Rule 315 reads :

> " 315: If the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words has or have been used in debate which is or are defamatory or indecent, or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such word or words be expunged from the proceedings of the Assembly. "

Please note the words : defamatory, indecent, unparliamentary and undignified. These words may kindly be noted, and the vast scope that it gives to the Hon. Speaker may also be considered.

If the Speaker is of the opinion, that means, if the speaker is satisfied subjectively that word or words have been used which are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or even undignified, as my friend Mr. Gangadhar was observing, that it is to be accompanied with reasons and all that, will not hold water if they carefully read the wording of rule 315. Therefore it is clear if we look into the provision of rule 325 :

> " All matters not specifically provided for in these rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be regulated in such manner as the Speaker may from time to time direct. "

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—I want to know whether we are having a full-fledged debate.

Sri K. H. SRINIVASA.—I am not yeilding.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—On a Point of order. I want to know whether the powers of the speaker regarding recording of the proceedings is under discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have permitted some members to speak.

SRI K. H. SRINIVASA.—If we read rule 325 we see that all matters not specifically provided for in these rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be regulated in such manner as the Speaker may from time to time direct. If we carefully read these two rules there can be no doubt as to the nature and scope of the power that is vested with the Speaker to deal with such remarks or phrases. If at all there had to be discussion regarding violation of the provisions of either rule 314 or 315 or 325, it cannot be discussed as coming under rule 312 because rule 312 contemplates only matter which will not be amounting to point of order If we want to say something which amounts to a point of order it can be raised under rule 311. But the hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa has given notice under rule 312 and what he has stated is beyond the scope of the discussion that can be allowed for a notice under rule 312. I do not therefore agree that hon Member Sri Siddaveerappa has raised a very important point of law which is worth serious consideration of the House. On the other hand I have no hesitation to submit humbly that he has tried in the guise of this notice under rule 312 unsuccessfully to explain his conduct of yesterday and unfortunately has cast an allegation against the Speaker and has abused rule 312.

SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have a personal explanation.

SRI B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—My friend referred to me and said what I said was not in consonance with law. If you read 314, it says " The Secretary shall cause to be prepared a full report of the proceedings of the Assembly at each of its sitting . . ." again 315 says "If the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words has or have been used in debate which is or are defamatory or indecent, or un-parliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such word or words be expunged from the proceedings of the Assembly." These two are regulated by rule 316. That is the guiding factor. It says :

> The portion of the proceedings of the Assembly so expunged shall be marked by asterisks and an explantory foot-note shall be inserted in the proceedings as follows :
>
> "expunged as ordered by the Chair."

So, the entire report must be there and the portion to be expunged shall be marked by asterisks and an explanatory foot note to be inserted.

Rules 314 to 316 say how proceedings have to be recorded. My friend was saying that rule 325 gives ample powers to do and undo anything. But the Speaker has no such powers. What it says is in all matters not specifically provided for in these rules, some discretion is vested in the Speaker. Now the Chair has to guide the House. Persons who framed these rules are intelligent enough that they thought such contingencies might arise. That is why they have framed these rules and they have made specific provision that whatever transpires must be recorded. The hon. Member Sri Bangarappa was urging a

(SRI B. P. GANGADHAR)

sensible point. Supposing either a Minister or any Member of this House were to make any statement defamatory, it may catch the eye of the Speaker or not. If the remark is there, the person concerned is entitled to move a privilege motion. So if all these things were to be expunged or not recorded, whatever that the hon. Member said which is defamatory will go and the concerned aggrieved person whose name has been drawn will have no remedy. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that whatever transpires in the House must be recorded. If for any reason a particular sentence or word or phrase is defamatory he may direct that those words may be removed but an explanatory note must be added.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have a personal explanation to make on what the Hon. Member Sri Srinivas said about me. He said that under some guise I wanted to explain away my conduct of yesterday. I would like to tell him that I have not done anything ignoble as to explain away my conduct. After all he is an young friend whom I like. Otherwise I could have been harsh. What I want to tell him is this. If he reads the proceedings of the Mother of Parliament and reads various text-books on the Mother of parliament he will find that instances are not wanting where when the Speaker abuses the powers that are given to him he has been given much more serious treatment by the Members of the House. In fact there are cases where we find he is physically expelled from the House. Therefore let him understand that the Speaker is the custodian of the prerogative, privilege, dignity and what not, of the entire House He does not come here in an Imperial tone and say "I command". This shall not happen. We are not going to bend to the Speaker till he makes proper amends and says that he has improved the matter.

Sri B. RACHAIAH (Minister for Agriculture)—I rise on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The last portion of hon. Member Sri Siddaveerappa's statement has no propriety. I do not agree with what Sri Siddaveerappa stated.

† **Sri B. RACHAIAH.**—Sir, you have been pleased to allow hon. Member Sri H. Siddaveerappa to make a personal statemet under Rule 312. In your wisdom you have allowed him to make a statement. When he was making a personal statement, he dragged the name of the Hon. Speaker and the Chair. He made remarks about the way in which the Hon. Speaker conducted himself. I think constitutional provisions provide for bringing a no-confidence motion and making criticisms about the conduct of the Speaker. And this has, to a certain extent, given room for discussion on the point whether the Speaker has the right to direct the Official Reporters not to take down anything that is going on. Sir, I wish to draw your kind attention to Rule

No. 287. I would like to read the Rule for the benefit of the Members. It is as follows:

"A member desiring to make any observations on any matter before the Assembly shall speak from his place, shall rise when he speaks and shall address the Speaker:

Pravided that a member disabled by sickness or infirmity may be permitted to speak sitting."

So, if a Member wants to catch the eye of the Speaker, he has to rise in his place and the Speaker should order that he has the floor to speak.

Sri AZIZ SAIT.—He is speaking as a Minister. He has forgotten his days as Member. What does he know about the difficulties of the Members in catching the eye of the Speaker?

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—I can understand some interruptions and interjections in this House and taking a few seconds of the House but not this kind of continued interruption.

Rule 287 lays down certain procedure as to how a member can catch the eye of the Speaker and when the Speaker specifically orders that a particular Member has the floor, then the proceeding starts. If so many members simultaneously stand and speak without the permission of the Chair they cannot be heard and then it will be very difficult for even the Reporters to take down what is going on. Until the Spsaker gives permission to a particular Member to speak, the proceedings cannot be taken as official proceedings. The Secretary gives the order to the Reporters to record only when the Speaker permits a member to speak. In the Lok Sabha also this question has been raised and the same ruling has been given and we have copied almost all the rules of the Lok Sabha. Let me read from the Lok Sabhadebates of 12th November 1968 - page 182.

Shri Gunanand Thakur..... .....

"Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not permitted you to speak.

"It will not be taken down. If you want to disturb the whole House without any result, please do it. But I have not permitted you and I am not going to permit you. It is not fair .....(Interruptions). No please.....(Interruption).

"Sri GUNANAND THAKUR * * * * Not recorded."

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Under what Rule was the ruling given?

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—We are almost following the rules made in the Lok Sabha. When the Speaker of the Parliament of our country has given a ruling on the matters, it will be really a guiding factor for all of us.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—I want to know whether this House has sovereign status.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Are we subordinate to the Parliament?

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—I am not yielding.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Should we look to the proceedings of some other House? The Hon. Minister must first state the Rule of the Lok Sabha and also quote our corresponding Rule so that we may know whether both the Rules are identical and then think of adopting that ruling of the Lok Sabha Speaker. Otherwise, the Lok Sabha ruling will not be relevent here because we have got our own rules. My submission is that what the Hon. Minister is saying is not to the point.

The Rules of procedure adopted by this House is Bible for us and we are not supposed to be guided by some other rules.

3-30 P.M.

Sri B. RACHIAH.—They may or may not agree with me, but I should be allowed to speak when I have been permitted by the Speaker to speak. I have been hearing them patiently and so let them lend their ears to me for some time. It does not matter whether they agree with me or not.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR. —We will agree with you if what you say is correct but we cannot agree with what is wrong.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—I am not misleading the House when I say that the Lok Sabha rule is the same as our rule.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There cannot be a point of order on a point of order. The Minister himself is on a point of order.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—I would refer hon. Members to rules 379, 380 and 381 of the Lok Sabha Rules and they are the same as our rules of procedure.

One more question was raised whether we are autonomous or subordinate to the Lok Sabha. Of course, we are autonomous and we have given these rules to ourselves here. We are guided by these rules, but for the purpose of convenience we often refer to certain decisions of the Lok Sabha.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA. —Can he say whether the High Court is bound by the ruling of the Supreme Court? Show me if there is any such provision. We are a sovereign body. We are independent of Parliament. We are not subordinate to Lok Sabha. We are supreme and we have got our own rules.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—But sometimes we refer to the decision and the proceedings of the Lok Sabha and also of the House of Commons. That has been done in this Assembly several times. Therefore, I have a right to refer to it.

Sri N. HUTCHMASTHI GOWDA.—When it is convenient to you, you refer to Lok Sabha and when it is not convenient you do not refer to it.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—Rules 286 and 287 give power to the Speaker to conduct the proceedings in such manner and give direction to any hon. Member to speak on the subject before the House. Without being called upon to speak, if a member were to speak, it cannot become proceedings. Yesterday when some hon. Members stood up, the Speaker has not called upon any member to participate in the debate. There were a large number of members speaking simultaneously without the permission of the Chair. Rule 313 also gives power to the Speaker to maintain order and it says that the Speaker shall have all powers necessary for the purpose of enforcing his decisions.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Not in contravention of rule 315. When there is a specific provision that will have precedence. Residuary power comes in only when there is no specific provision.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—I have pointed out two provisions which are specific. Under rules 286 and 287 unless a member is called upon to speak, the proceedings cannot be in order. Therefore unless members have the permission of the Chair it cannot be reported and the Secretary cannot take such proceedings into account. Not only that, there was some reference by the hon. Member Sri Nagappa to say that when the proceedings are going on, if a member were to laugh, that laughter also has to be entered in the report. When the Speaker has allowed a member to speak, if there is any interruption by another member, that will come, but if the Speaker has not allowed any member to speak, then that cannot be part of the proceedings of the House. Therefore the Speaker has got a right to give direction to the Reporters not to take down certain proceedings.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Now the House will adjourn for half an hour.

The House adjourned at Forty Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Fifteen Minutes past Four of the Clock.